

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 6 and 8-11 have been amended. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, in the specification at page 15, lines 10-14 and steps S103 and S202 of FIGS. 6 and 7 and their corresponding text. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in light of the remarks presented herein are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Haris (US 2001/0013004) in view of Lewis (US 2002/0029194) and Ephrati (US 7,296,001). Claims 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Haris in view of Lewis and Regan (US 6,898,574). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Haris in view of Ephrati and Regan. Claims 6, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Haris in view of Lewis, Regan, Yajima (US 5,331,543) and Ephrati. These rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the claims as amended.

The present invention relates to managing business deals. For example, claim 4 as amended recites a server comprising a number of elements in combination. The claimed combination includes a data collecting unit, a data analyzer, and a deal manager. The data collecting unit collects deal data from a terminal operated by a sales agent. The data analyzer analyzes the deal data to determine whether or not it fails to have predetermined data items. The deal manager manages the deals, which have been determined by the data analyzer to not have failures, to determine whether each of the deals should be continued or not based on the deal data of the deal concerned. Claims 1, 9 and 11 recite similar limitations.

Advantages of the present invention include helping supervisors make business decisions more effectively by managing whether each of the deals should be continued or not. For example, in one embodiment the system may monitor deal data to identify failures, such as missing items, that could impact the ability of a supervisor to make an informed business decision on the deal, and notify a sales agent if the deal data has certain failures. The system may also notify the supervisor

of the completed deal data to request that the supervisor determine whether the deal should be continued or not, or the system itself may determine whether the deal should be continued or not based on its deal data.

The claimed combination of elements, including a deal manager managing deals to determine whether each of the deals should be continued or not, is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, viewed alone or in combination.

For example, the Examiner concedes that Haris, Lewis and Regan fail to disclose generating a message for requesting a supervisor of a sales agent to make a business decision on a particular deal. To overcome this deficiency of Haris, Lewis and Regan, the Examiner relies on Yajima for providing this teaching. However, the portion of Yajima upon which the Examiner relies for this teaching, col. 1, lines 16-19, does not teach generating a message for requesting a supervisor of a sales agent to make a business decision on a particular deal. Rather, the cited portion merely states "[i]n order for a supervisor of an organization to make a decision, he has to obtain results of business processes made by his related staff and make a judgment on the basis of the information." In contrast to the claimed subject matter, the cited portion of Yajima provides no teaching or suggestion of generating a message requesting a supervisor to make a business decision on a particular deal as claimed. Further, Yajima provides no teaching or suggestion of a deal manager managing deals to determine whether they should be continued or not as claimed. These deficiencies of Yajima are not compensated for by the additional references of Haris, Lewis, Ephrati and Regan.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 116692004200.

Dated: November 19, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Alex Chartove
Alex Chartove

Registration No.: 31,942
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 400
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7744